DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 317 CG 006 666

AUTHOR Kleinke, Chris L.; And Others
TITLE Evaluation of a Person Who Uses Another's Name in Ingratiating and Non-ingratiating Situations.
PUB DATE Apr 71
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at Western Psychological Association convention, San Francisco, Calif., April 21-24, 1971
AVAILABLE FROM Chris L. Kleinke, Dept. of Psych., Claremont Men's College, Pitzer Hall, Claremont, Calif. 91711

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior; *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Interaction; Intercommunication; *Interpersonal Competence; Interpersonal Relationship; *Social Relations

ABSTRACT

Three experiments are reported, each of which was designed to investigate how people in ingratiating and non-ingratiating situations would be evaluated when they communicated immediacy through the use of another person's name. While immediacy is acknowledged to be generally associated with positive affect, it is suggested that evaluation of a person who communicates immediacy would depend on the appropriateness of this communication to the context or situation. The authors predicted that when the use of another person's name occurred under conditions of non-ingratiation, it would be positively evaluated, while the reverse would be true under conditions of ingratiation. Results of all 3 experiments are in accord with the prediction, thus providing support for Jones (1964) ingratiation-attractiveness model. Possibilities for future research are suggested. (TL)

ED056317

EVALUATION OF A PERSON WHO USES ANOTHER'S NAME IN INGRATIATING AND NON-INGRATIATING SITUATIONS[1]

Chris L. Kleinke[2]
Claremont Men's College

Richard A. Staneski
Claremont Men's College

and Pam Weaver
Pitzer College

Jones (1964) has described tactics of ingratiation including complimentary other enhancement, conformity in opinion, judgment and behavior, presentation of self in a socially approved manner, and rendering of favors. Another tactic for an ingratiator might be to increase the immediacy between himself and the person from whom he desires approval. The following experiments were designed to investigate how people in ingratiating and non-ingratiating situations would be evaluated when they communicated immediacy through the use of another person's name. Immediacy has been shown by Wiener and Mehrabian (1968) to be generally associated with positive affect. Evaluation of a person who communicates immediacy, however, would most likely depend on the appropriateness of this communication to the context or situation. It was predicted in the present studies that when the use of another person's name was attributable to tacting (Skinner, 1957; Bem, 1965) or conditions of non-ingratiation (Jones, 1964), it would be evaluated with general positive affect. When the use of another person's name was attributable to manding or ingratiation, it was expected to be evaluated with general negative affect.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CG 006 666

C. L. Kleinke, R. A. Staneski, and P. Weaver

Standardization of Situations

Experiments 1 and 3 were designed to place name users in ingratiating situations and Experiment 2 was devised as a non-ingratiating condition for a name user. An independent measure of the ingratiation manipulation was gained from the following rating procedure.

Twenty male and twenty-four female introductory psychology students at Chaffey College were given detailed descriptions of the situations in Experiments 1, 2, and 3 and told that they would be asked to place themselves as much as possible in each of these situations and make evaluations on a number of factors. The first question instructed subjects to judge the respective target persons (student interviewing for job, female interviewer, male placed with female) on the basis of how dependent they were on the approval or attraction of the evaluators (job interviewer, male interviewees, female) in the situation. A second question requested subjects to rate the extent to which each target person's behavior in the given situation might be a function of outer consequences as opposed to reflecting his or her true feelings. The third question had subjects rate whether the respective target persons were in a position where use of the evaluator's name was appropriate and legitimate or inappropriate and illicit. All ratings were arranged on a 12-point polar scale. Subjects were presented with a short lecture on the definitions and differences between manding and tacting and ingratiation and non-ingratiation before

the ratings were made.

In Table 1 it is seen that the target persons in Experiments 1 and

---
Insert Table 1 about here
---

3 were judged to be in manding and ingratiating situations, while the target person in Experiment 2 was seen relatively in a tacting and non-ingratiating position. Newman-Keuls tests on the first two rating items showed that the respective means for Experiment 2 were significantly greater ($p < .01$) than the means for Experiments 1 and 3. Experiments 1 and 3 did not differ significantly. A Newman-Keuls test on the third rating item determined the mean for Experiment 2 to be significantly greater than the means for Experiment 3 ($p < .05$) and Experiment 1 ($p < .01$). Again, Experiments 1 and 3 did not differ. Males and females were consistent on all ratings.

Experiment 1

Method

Two series of tape recordings were made of two male college seniors[3] in an ostensible five minute interview for a position of

research assistant. In the first series of recordings one applicant (according to script) used the interviewer's proper name six times and the other applicant did not use the interviewer's name. In the second series the conditions were reversed. The recordings were played to four introductory psychology classes at Cal Poly, Pomona, under the guise of a study in person perception. The subjects were instructed that they would be asked to listen to two job interviews and rate the job applicants they heard on a questionnaire which was given to them before the tapes were played. Classes A and B heard the first series of recordings and classes C and D heard the second series of recordings. In addition, classes A and C were given neutral instructions ("This was only a preliminary interview, there were several positions available, and there was no reason to believe the applicants were under pressure to make a special impression"), and classes B and D were given ingratiation instructions ("This was the final interview for a single research position and the applicants may have felt pressure to make a good impression"). In all cases, the subjects were told that the job applicants were unaware at the time of the interview that the recordings were being made.

After hearing each of two interviews, subjects rated the respective job applicants on a "Job Applicant Rating Form," which consisted of a series of adjectives and evaluative statements on a nine-point scale (see Table 1). Several of the adjectives used had been previously found to discriminate differentially liked persons (Lott, Lott, Reed, & Crow, 1970).

Results

Subjects' comments after the experiment and preliminary data analysis indicated that the neutral versus ingratiation manipulation was not effective. On this basis, it was decided to treat the results from classes B and D as a replication of the experiment involving classes A and C. Results were analyzed in analyses of variance for sex, repeated over two measures (use of name, no use of name). Classes A and C were combined and classes B and D were combined to balance out individual differences between the two job applicants.

It can be seen in Table 1 that job applicants who used the interviewer's name were rated as significantly more motivated by the desire to get the job (manding, ingratiation) than job applicants who did not use the interviewer's name. There was a significant tendency in the experiment, and in the replication, for the name users to be evaluated more negatively than the no-name users. There were no Sex X Use of Name interactions in any of the analyses, indicating that the results in Table 1 held for both sexes.

Insert Table 2 about here

For all groups combined, females rated the job applicants as significantly more sincere, genuine, competent, likeable, and desirable to know than did males.

Experiment 2

Method

This experiment, modeled after Mehrabian (1967), consisted of an attractive female Pitzer College senior interviewing male

freshman and sophomore students from Claremont Men's College about their attitudes toward all male colleges compared with coed colleges. Two subjects were always interviewed simultaneously. The experiment was conducted in a large experimental room, with the subjects seated at one side of a 34 x 56 inch table and the interviewer seated at the other side. During the 10 minute interview the interviewer used one subject's first name eleven times and the other subject's first name one time, according to random assignment. The interviewer was trained to treat both subjects equally in terms of gaze, attention, social approval, and primacy of questioning, and was not aware of the dependent measures and hypotheses of the study.

Subjects were recruited by their introductory psychology instructor with the cover story that they would be helping a Pitzer College psychology major with an attitude survey, while at the same time aiding the instructor in a study of interviewer behavior. It was explained that the instructor had gained permission of the interviewer to tape record her voice in the interview and give a short questionnaire after the interview was over. The above procedure was followed in order to make the interviewer appear independent of the experimenter and to provide a rationale for the rating form given to the subjects at the end of the interview. None of the subjects were previously acquainted with the interviewer.

Results

One of the subjects stated in the post-experimental interview (Orne, 1962) that he had become aware of the interviewer using the other subject's name and his data were excluded from analysis. No

other subject verbalized the difference in use of name by the interviewer, leaving 13 subjects in the name condition and 12 subjects in the no name condition. Subjects rated the interviewer on an "Interviewer Rating Form," which consisted of items similar to those used in Experiment 1. Three of the questions read, "How much would you say you personally liked the interviewer," "How much would you say the interviewer liked you," and "How much would you say the interviewer liked the other person who was interviewed with you?" These questions were scored 12 for the response, "Liked her (me, him) very much" and 1 for the response, "Did not particularly like her (me, him)." The remainder of the rating form included the adjective pairs, competent--incompetent, outgoing--sticking to herself, and phony--genuine, also on a 12-point scale.

Subjects who were not called by name rated the interviewer as liking the other subject significantly more than she liked them ($\bar{X}$s = 7.50 versus 7.00, t = 2.62, df = 11, $p < .01$). Subjects who were called by name saw the interviewer as liking them more than the other subject, but the difference was not significant ($\bar{X}$s= 7.15 versus 7.07). Subjects who were called by name stated that they liked the interviewer significantly more than subjects not called by name ($\bar{X}$s= 9.27 versus 8.16, t = 1.85, df = 23, $p < .05$). Unexpectedly, subjects not called by name rated the interviewer as significantly more competent (scored 12) than subjects called by name ($\bar{X}$s = 10.7 versus 8.91, t = 3.00, df = 23, $p < .01$, two-tailed). There were no significant differences in the way subjects called by name and not called by name rated the interviewer on the outgoing--sticking to herself and phony--genuine dimensions.

Bemian Replication of Experiment 2

Introductory psychology students at Chaffey College listened to three random tape recordings of the interviews in Experiment 2 and made ratings after the method of Bem (1965, 1967) and Hastorf, Kite, Gross, and Wolfe (1965). Permission had been gained from interviewees in Experiment 2 before the tapes were played. Subjects were asked to place themselves both in the position of the male interviewees who were called by name and the male interviewees who were not called by name by the female interviewer and complete a rating scale as the respective interviewees would. Three items, "She liked me very much--She did not like me at all," "I liked her very much--I did not like her at all," "She liked the other person very much--She did not like the other person at all," were arranged on a 12-point scale with the left side scored 1.

Data from 23 males and 25 females showed that the male interviewees called by name were expected to rate the female interviewer as liking them more than the male interviewees not called by name ($\bar{X}$s = 3.79 versus 7.76, $F = 20.3$, $df = 1/46$, $p < .001$) and to have higher liking for the interviewer than males not called by name ($\bar{X}$s = 4.33 versus 7.32, $F = 15.7$, $df = 1/46$, $p < .001$). The male interviewees called by name were also expected to rate the interviewer as having lower regard for the other interviewee than the male interviewees not called by name ($\bar{X}$s = 7.63 versus 4.38, $F = 18.2$, $df = 1/46$, $p < .001$). Results were consistent for both sexes.

Experiment 3

Method

This experiment, described as a study investigating how people get to know each other, involved placing a previously unacquainted male and female student in a room with a tape recorder for 15 minutes. Freshman female subjects came from Pitzer College and freshman and sophomore male subjects were students at Claremont Men's College. All subjects were given the above description of the experiment at the time they were recruited. An experimental room was used in which subjects sat in comfortable chairs facing each other across the end of a 34 x 56 inch table. It was arranged that the male subjects would be met by an experimenter immediately before each session and instructed secretly, and by random assignment, either to use the girl's first name as often as possible (average use was six times) or not to use it at all. The male subjects were encouraged otherwise to act in the manner which was most natural to them, and they accepted their respective assignments with good spirit. None of the subjects were informed beforehand of the purpose and hypotheses of the experiment and they did not know that a rating form would be given at the end. After the experiment was completed all subjects were sent a brief summary of its purposes and results through the campus mail.

Results

The rating form given to the subjects was similar to the forms used in Experiments 1 and 2. It can be seen in Table 3 that the males who used the females' names were rated by the females as significantly more motivated to make a good impression (manding, ingratiation) than

the males who did not use the females' names. Generally speaking, males who used the females' names were rated with more negative affect. The

---

Insert Table 3 about here

---

male subjects were given the same form on which to rate the females and showed no difference in their responses due to the use of name manipulation.

Discussion

The results of the experiments were according to prediction and consistent with Jones' (1964, p. 167) theoretical relationship between use of ingratiation and judged attractiveness of the ingratiator. When the name user was in a manding or ingratiating situation (Experiments 1 and 3), he was evaluated more negatively than the non-name user. In a tacting or non-ingratiating situation (Experiment 2), the name user was rated more positively than the non-name user.

The present experiments serve to suggest communication of immediacy as a tactic of ingratiation and demonstrate that the use of another person's name can be a meaningful variable in social psychological situations. The curvilinear nature of Jones' model could be tested by manipulating degree of dependence and amount of name usage in a parametric design.

In the preceding studies, the main variable by which name usage was judged to be manded and ingratiating or tacted and non-ingratiating was degree of dependence of the name user on the evaluating person. It would be valuable for additional research to incorporate some of the attribution variables suggested by Jones and Davis (1965), such as commonality, social

desirability, and hedonic relevance. In the future, a more comprehensive theory can be developed for predicting when ingratiation (by means of immediacy communication or other tactics) will be evaluated positively and when it will be evaluated negatively.

Footnotes

1. Requests for reprints should be sent to Chris L. Kleinke, Department of Psychology, Claremont Men's College, Pitzer Hall, Claremont, California 91711.

2. The authors wish to thank Frederick B. Meeker, Edward J. Panzer, and Dr. Dale Berger for their generous assistance with data analysis.

3. David Lapin, Richard Cramer, and James V. Morette posed for the interviews. They were not aware at the time of the nature and purpose of the study.

References

Bem, D. J. An experimental analysis of self-persuasion. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 199-208.

Bem, D. J. Self-perception: An alternative interpretation of cognitive dissonance phenomena. Psychological Review, 1967, 74, 183-200.

Hastorf, A. H., Kite, W. R., Gross, A. E., & Wolfe, L. J. The perception and evaluation of behavior change. Sociometry, 1965, 28, 400-410.

Jones, E. E. Ingratiation: A social psychological analysis. New York: Appleton, 1964.

Jones, E. E. & Davis, K. E. From acts to dispositions. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology. Vo. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965.

Lott, A. J., Lott, B. E., Reed, T., & Crow, T. Personality-trait descriptions of differentially liked persons. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 16, 284-290.

Mehrabian, A. Orientation behaviors and nonverbal attitude communication. Journal of Communication, 1967, 17, 324-332.

Orne, M. T. On the social psychology of the psychological experiment: With particular reference to demand characteristics and their implications. American Psychologist, 1962, 17, 776-783.

Skinner, B. F. Verbal behavior. New York: Appleton, 1957.

Wiener, M. & Mehrabian, A. Language within language: Immediacy a channel in verbal communication. New York: Appleton, 1968.

Table 1

Standardization of Situations

Employed in Experiments 1, 2, and 3

Rating Form Item (Scored 1)	Mean Ratings			F
	Experiment 1	Experiment 2	Experiment 3	(df = 84/2)
Target person is in a position where he (she) is dependent on the approval or attraction of the evaluator.	3.05	8.14	4.56	37.9*
Target person is in a position where his (her) behavior is mainly a function of outer consequences (trying to make a good impression, etc.)	3.93	8.57	4.95	29.1*
Target person is in a position where use of the evaluator's name is inappropriate and illicit.	5.69	8.79	6.81	14.5*

*$p < .001$

Table 2

Mean Evaluation Scores of Job Applicants

Who Used and Did Not Use Interviewer's Name

Rating Form Item		Classes A and C n = 69			Classes B and D n = 63		
Scored 1	Scored 9	Used Name	Did Not Use Name	F df = 1/67	Used Name	Did Not Use Name	F df = 1/61
applicant's responses reflected his true self	applicant's responses governed by desire to get the job	6.40	4.06	28.2***	5.86	3.94	23.5***
outgoing	sticking to himself	4.46	3.79	2.0	3.87	4.46	1.9
sincere	insincere	4.71	3.22	19.6***	4.72	3.38	13.8***
competent	incompetent	3.55	2.98	7.9**	3.47	3.09	4.2*
phony	genuine	4.42	6.55	40.2***	4.79	6.60	25.3***
liked him very much	disliked him very much	5.23	3.71	21.1***	4.79	3.92	23.9***
I would like to know him	I would not care to know him	5.36	3.95	15.2***	4.84	4.04	4.4*
I would hire him	I would not hire him	4.48	3.03	15.6***	4.49	3.29	9.8**

*p < .05
**p < .01
***p < .001

Table 3

Females' Evaluations of Males

Who Used or Did Not Use Their Name

Rating Form Item		$\bar{X}$ Used Name	$\bar{X}$ Did Not Use Name	t
Scored 1	Scored 12	n = 13	n = 12	df = 22
showed his true self	mainly tried to make a good impression	5.50	3.67	1.95*
outgoing	sticking to himself	5.25	3.42	2.61**
phony	genuine	8.83	10.67	2.42*
friendly	distant	4.67	2.41	2.94**
liked me very much	did not particularly like me	6.25	6.00	<1
liked him as a person	did not particularly like him as a person	5.33	4.17	1.16
was very much attracted toward him	was not particularly attracted toward him	7.00	6.25	<1
would like to participate in a second discussion with the same person	would not particularly care to participate in a second discussion with the same person	5.42	3.00	2.20*

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$